

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/597,161

Applicant(s)

OKABE ET AL.

Examiner

José R Díaz

Art Unit

2815

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) José R Díaz.

(3) Gregg Rosenblatt (Reg. No. 45,056).

(2) Eddie Lee (SPE).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 April 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 3 and 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: Cheung et al. (EP 0 840 361 A2).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussions focused over the § 103 rejection mailed on March 28, 2003. The examiner clarified the rejection and pointed out specific passages of the Cheung et al. reference. Further, the claimed temperature range was discussed with respect to the disclosure of Cheung et al.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


4/23/03
Examiner's signature, if required